DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 111 SO 002 364

AUTHOR Gibson, John S.
TITLE Toward Integration Through Education: Dichotomies of Purposes and Processes.
INSTITUTION Tufts Univ., Medford, Mass. Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs.
PUB DATE 5 Mar 71
NOTE 69p.; Speech presented at the Annual Conference on Civil and Human Rights in Education, National Education Association, March 5, 1971

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Classroom Integration; *Educational Quality; *Equal Education; *Integration Effects; Integration Plans; Integration Studies; Minority Group Children; Negro Education; Negro Students; Race Relations; Racial Attitudes; *Racial Integration; Racially Balanced Schools; *School Integration; Social Integration; Speeches

ABSTRACT

Beginning with the thesis that integrated education is indispensable to achieving an integrated society, the author examines first whether these assumptions behind school desegregation are valid or not, and why: that students will perform better academically, and that more democratic human relations will ensue. He presents evidence to show that racial mixes and interactions, without quality education, cannot and do not achieve these goals. The author then discusses four reasons for the inadequacies of integrated education: paradoxical teachers and teaching; patronizing curriculum; sterile instructional materials; and silent administrators. This is followed by an examination of the impact of these factors on different kinds of schools. In the third section of the paper, Toward Quality in Education, six components of quality education are proposed and discussed: a democratic school, quality teachers and teaching, integrated curriculum, authentic instructional resources, vigorous support from the school administration, and community-family-school relations. The caution is added that unless schools are joined by other social institutions, educational efforts toward an integrated society will have little effect. In conclusion, the author discusses some additional suggestions for advancing democratic human relations through education. (Author/JLB)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEH REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED 061111

CH

The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

# Toward Integration Through Education: Dichotomies of Purposes and Processes

John S. Gibson

SP002 364

March 5, 1971

Toward Integration Through Education: Dichotomies of Purposes and Processes

Contents


Introduction

I. Integration in Education: Achievements and Shortcomings 5

A. Achievements of Integration in Education 5

1. The Record 5

2. Reasons for the Achievements of Integration in Education 6

a. The Viability of Interracial Contacts 6

b. Quality of School Services and Processes 7

B. Shortcomings of Integration in Education 10

1. The Record 10

2. The Reasons for Shortcomings of Integration in Education 13

a. The Role of White Decision Makers 13

b. Inadequate Integrated Education 14

c. Quality of Whites in Desegregated Schools 15

d. Patterns of Resegregation 16

II. The Inadequacies of Integrated Education in the United States 20

A. Four Dimensions of the Low State of Integrated Education 20

1. Parodoxical Teachers and Teaching 20

a. Preparation of Teachers 21

b. Sensitivity and Teachers 22

c. The Teaching-Learning Process 23

2. The Patronizing Curriculum 23

3. Sterile Instructional Materials 26

4. Silent Administrators 31

B. Impact of Inadequate Integrated Education on the Schools 32

1. Schools with Integration in Education 33

2. Schools Where Segregation Remains 34

3. White Schools 34

III. Toward Quality in Education 35

A. Quality School Services and Processes 35

B. Quality in Integrated Education 38

1. The Democratic School 39

2. Quality Teachers and Teaching 39

a. The Enlightened Teacher 40

b. The Sensitive Teacher 41

c. The Effective Teacher 42

3. The Integrated Curriculum 44

4. Authentic Instructional Resources 47

5. Vigorous Support from the School Administration 48

6. Community-Family-School Relations 49

IV. Schools, Society, and Integration 50

V. The Road Ahead 52

A. Using What We Think We Know 53

B. Implementing and Accounting with Respect to Integration Through Education 55

C. Whites and Integration Through Education 56

D. Desegregation and the North 57

References 60

The Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs
Tufts University
Medford, Massachusetts 02155

# Toward Integration Through Education: Dichotomies of Purposes and Processes

John S. Gibson

First, it is a privilege to dedicate this paper to my friend, Meyer Weinberg, one of the nation's most distinguished authorities on and practitioners of integrated education. Editor of Integrated Education: Race and Schools, author and editor of many books and monographs dealing with a tremendous variety of issues in the realm of integrated education, especially the indispensable volume, Desegregated Research: An Appraisal, he is also an outstanding member of the faculty of the City Colleges of Chicago. Weinberg's scientific and personal research and inquiries into the processes of desegregation and integration have greatly strengthened the intellectual and empirical foundations for advancing integration through education. We salute Meyer Weinberg and express our deep gratitude to him for bringing the realities of democracy closer to its ideals.

The central thesis of this paper is one that Mr. Weinberg and many others of good will have been making for years: Integrated education is indispensable to

---

Keynote address by Dr. John S. Gibson, Director of the Lincoln Filene Center and Lincoln Filene Professor of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Tufts University, before the National Education Association's Ninth Annual Conference on Civil and Human Rights in Education, March 5, 1971

achieving an integrated society. Unless authentic and relevant integrated education takes place in all schools in the nation, irrespective of the racial, ethnic, or nationality mix of those schools, the capacity of education to advance the goal of an integrated society is in grave doubt. We find that, in general, integrated education through the classroom teaching process is sadly lacking in America. We point to very basic needs, especially the enlightened, sensitive, and effective teacher, to make integrated education a reality.

Following this introduction, we appraise first some achievements and shortcomings of integration in education, or the mixing of students in the schools according to ratios or percentages of the races. Then we turn to the low state of integrated education, or the processes in the schools which focus on advancing democratic human relations through education. Third, we suggest how the quality of integrated education may best serve its goals, and then give brief consideration to other societal institutions which must make more significant contributions to integration in America. Finally, we submit our conclusions and recommendations for improving the quality and quantity of both integration in education and integrated education. Citations for the research on which this paper is based are in a section at the end of the paper.

Integration in education is the bringing together in schools and school systems of students of different races, nationalities, and ethnic groups. While there are many schools in America that have always had integration in education, the deliberate movement toward integration in education through various

processes of desegregating segregated schools is less than fifteen years old. Integration, as such, is "the realization of equal opportunity by deliberate cooperation and without regard to racial or other barriers." [1] This paper does not deal with school systems that have genuinely integrated schools, although we consider authentic integration to be one of the most noble goals of our society. This paper does deal directly with desegregation, "the abolition of social practices that bar equal access to opportunity." [2] The procedures for abolishing such "social practices" include busing, pairing of schools, redrawing of school district lines, and other means of bringing about mixes of students as determined by the courts and other officials in the Federal, state, and local governments. Integration in education, as used in this paper, thus refers to schools and school systems that have been or are being desegregated and that hopefully are on the way to becoming truly integrated. Both desegregation and integration seek to remove the cancer of de jure school segregation, as well as de facto segregation, which James Baldwin points out really means "Negroes are segregated but nobody did it." [3]

Integrated education, on the other hand, means advancing democratic human relations through all the components of the teaching-learning process in the schools and classrooms irrespective of the racial, ethnic, or nationality mix involved.

The Commissioner of Education of the State of New York, Dr. Ewald B. Nyquist, submits this definition of integrated education:

> It is a series of experiences in which the child learns that he lives in a multi-racial society, in a multi-racial world which is largely non-white, non-democratic, and non-Christian, a world in which no race can choose to live apart in isolation or be quarantined by the rest. It is one that teaches him to judge individuals for what they are rather than by what group they belong to. From this viewpoint, he learns that differences among peoples are not as great as similarities, and that difference is a source of richness and value rather than a thing to be feared and denied. And these things can be taught in every classroom even where all children are of the same color, class, and creed.

The goals for integration in education are twofold: to advance student performance through quality in education and through access to equality to educational opportunity for all students; and to further democratic human relations, especially in reducing covert prejudice in the mind and overt discriminatory behavior toward others. The thesis of integration in education is that mixing white students with students from various other racial, ethnic, and national groups in a given community will further the goals of integration in education.

The principal goal for integrated education is to advance democratic human relations through the teaching-learning process in the classroom, whether or not that classroom is homogeneous in racial, ethnic, or national composition. A component of this goal is quality of school services and processes.

It is the contention of this paper that integration in education is not enough by itself to further its goal of improving democratic human relations, and it is our belief that too many assume that school mixes of students from different groups in fact does advance that goal. A further contention is that the quality of

integrated education is sadly lacking in desegregated schools, and in schools where integration in education is not present owing to de facto segregation or the general absence of students from minority groups. We hold, then, that the overall cause of integration through education is not being well served in the United States. We profoundly endorse integration in education, but without integrated education, the capacity of education to advance a democratic society cannot succeed.

## I. Integration in Education: Achievements and Shortcomings

We are all familiar with the many different patterns of integration in education. The principal assumptions behind these patterns of desegregating formerly segregated schools and school systems are that students from minority groups will perform better academically in desegregated schools and that better democratic human relations will ensue because of the mix. Are these assumptions valid or not, and why?

### A. Achievements of Integration in Education

#### 1. The Record

With respect to black students, the data are heavy to indicate that "academic attainments of both white and Negro pupils are significantly higher in majority-white classrooms than in majority-Negro classrooms."[4] (Research citations for this statement are set forth at the end of this paper.) Although the data on groups other than blacks, especially Spanish-surnamed (including Mexican-Americans and Puerto Ricans), American Indians, and Orientals, are

not sufficient to indicate that students from these groups achieve as well as blacks in desegregated schools [5], we can say that the first goal of integration in education is meeting with success, irrespective of the many shortcomings of integration in education, which we shall discuss shortly.

2. Reasons for the Achievements of Integration in Education

a. The Viability of Interracial Contacts

Moving from the segregated school to the desegregated school, many black students perceive their fellow white students as ones who are different and generally more advantaged. There is a discrepancy between the two groups of students; however, perception of discrepancy by the blacks is generally motivating from the point of view of their desire to reduce that discrepancy through academic achievement.

The feelings of "I can make it," "I can prove myself," and "I can do as well as white students" are characteristic of many black students in desegregated schools. Black social-status aspirations as compared with whites are also quite important. New and different kinds of students to compare oneself with and to serve as a measure for peer emulation are part of the social dynamics which make integration in education a success in so many school systems. The data are strong about the importance of one's peers and the peer group with respect to academic achievement. School environments that provide for mixes in terms of the race and socio-economic status of students do give students who come from schools marked by segregation and low socio-economic status the

opportunity to achieve through competition with and emulation of others. In brief, there is much one can attribute to the basic mix of students in the desegregated school as conducive to improving scholastic achievement of minority-group students.

b. Quality of School Services and Processes

It may be, however, that the fact that minority-group students, when desegregated, generally go to schools with better school services and processes than those they experienced in segregated schools does as much or more to explain the achievements of integration in education than the mere mix of students. Dr. Kenneth B. Clark makes this important point:

> It is not the white child per se whose presence leads to higher achievement for the Negro child who associates with him in class, but the quality of the education provided because the white child is there that makes the difference, or so I believe the empirical evidence indicates. [6]

Whether racially balanced classrooms will exert a favorable influence on the performance of minority-group students depends on the school's ability, as Katz notes, to create "an atmosphere of genuine respect and acceptance." [7] I might add that most of the citations I have seen about the achievements of integration in education are qualified with statements similar to those of Clark and Katz.

Together these two statements, and many others in a similar vein, suggest that achievement of minority-group members in desegregated schools may be attributed to a considerable extent to the quality of education they

receive in schools with a majority-white population, and that quality of education is usually found where there are the financial resources to buy school services and processes of quality. Such resources are not generally found in neighborhoods and areas where minority groups reside as well, obviously, as among poor whites such as those in Appalachia. Therefore, quality education, and thus student achievement, for minority-group members usually can be gained only in schools and school systems supported by those with ample economic resources, or middle- to upper-class whites.

Extensive research by Guthrie and associates supports this important statement. The sequence Guthrie presents is as follows: School services and processes for students directly relate to the environment and socio-economic status of students, and student achievement is directly related to the quality of school services and processes. Life options and opportunities of students are attributable to their school performance. The better the environment and the socio-economic status of students and their families, the better the school services and processes; the better the school services and processes, the higher levels of achievement are recorded; and the higher achievement means greater life options. The reverse is the case for students from poor environments and families. The cycle repeats itself as those with greater life options and opportunities generally have children who receive quality schooling, while those who are defeated in the sequence have children who attend inadequate schools. [8] Thus the rich become richer and the poor, poorer, and the main way

to intervene in this intolerable cycle is to uplift the quality of school environment and services irrespective of the findings of Coleman and others who presume to declare that

> . . . schools bring little influence to bear upon a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context . . . [9]

It may be a reality that at present the only way we can uplift the achievement of members of minority groups is to educate them in schools which are majority-white in composition, because it is only to these schools that this society is willing to allocate resources toward quality school services and processes. We can no longer condone this situation.

Our findings indicate that desegregated schools do have better school services, including more experienced teachers, better facilities, more up-to-date textbooks, innovative curricula, and the other components of quality in education than do segregated schools. Where research findings do identify the relationship of the variable of quality school services and processes to the achievement of minority-group members in desegregated schools, it is quite clear that this variable is essential to such achievement. To put the matter another way, mere desegregation and mixing of students, without quality school services and processes, will hardly advance the academic achievement of minority-group members. Clearly a combination of both desegregation and quality education is essential to uplifting the achievement of minority-group students, and we contend here that quality in education should be available to all students, whether in desegregated schools or not.

There is also little doubt that most minority-group students and their parents want a quality education wherever and whenever they can get it. One major reason for this is the black power movement, which always was in the hearts of many black people, but which found leadership in the latter half of the 1960's. Black power, which leads to positive self- and group-concept, self-respect, and greater motivation among blacks to succeed in all walks of life, has led to the undeniable quest for a better education to make that success possible.

In any event, achievement of minority-group students in desegregated schools is a fact, for whatever reason. We must accelerate the pace of integration in education, providing we eliminate its shortcomings. And many shortcomings there are!

B. Shortcomings of Integration in Education

It is my conviction that we should not be so dazzled by the ideal and process of integration in education that we should put on blinders with respect to its shortcomings. We believe deeply in integration in education, and where there are shortcomings, let us do all within our power to eliminate them. But let us not deny that they exist.

1. The Record

First, we have more segregated schools today than we did at the time of the famous Supreme Court decision calling for school desegregation, Brown vs. the Board of Education of Topeka, of 1954. Many factors account for

this situation, but it is a fact, and thus we have a long way to go to make the promise of that landmark decision a reality.

Secondly, research on desegregation points to many instances where desegregated schools, for various reasons, do not help minority-group members to advance and thus do not improve the quality of education for these students or advance quality of educational opportunity for them. [10] Again, the bulk of the data points toward increases in minority-group achievement in desegregated schools, but the evidence is hardly all on that side.

In the third place, the impact of desegregation in the South on black teachers, administrators, formerly black schools, and others has been so damaging in many instances that many black educational leaders wonder whether desegregation really can succeed for them and for students. Demotions in rank of black teachers and principals in newly desegregated schools, assignment of black teachers to teach in areas where they have no certification and then firing them for that reason, and the fears and threats that black educators confront in desegregated schools are part of the testimony of hardships and deprivations for these professional people.

In its testimony to the Senate Select Subcommittee on Equal Educational Opportunity in the summer of 1970, a National Education Association team described some grave shortcomings of "integration." When whites took over control of a black school, for example, a large mural depicting George Washington Carver and Booker T. Washington was painted over. This act points

to a "tragic consequence of desegregation . . . the forfeiture of school spirit and group identity. Left behind to be stored, scattered or abandoned are trophies, pictures, plaques, and every symbol of black identity, of black students' achievements." [11] Details gathered on Mississippi by the Delta Ministry and reported in the Harvard publication, Inequality in Education, are among the more vivid testimony of this dimension of desegregation in the South. [12]

In the fourth place, the "crossover teachers" (both black and white who are shifted from their former schools to desegregated schools in the South) are finding their new roles quite precarious. Their main problems revolve around discipline and classroom control; unfamiliarity with the backgrounds, racial situations, and language of their students; working with children who lack parental support; fear of loss in professional status; and inadequate support from their fellow teachers and administrators. Fear and isolation affect them deeply. What training they have had for the desegregated school has been most inadequate. Further, those in authority have tended to assign the inexperienced and even senile white teachers to formerly all-Negro schools and experienced, productive Negro teachers to formerly all-white schools. Most of those "in authority" are white. [13]

Fifth, testimony by Ralph Nader before the Subcommittee on Indian Education of the United States Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and writings and speeches by Indians, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans testify to the profound difficulties these other groups are encountering in

desegregated situations. Too often we refer only to blacks in connection with desegregation, while we tend to ignore the fact that millions of other minority-group students likewise are facing almost hopeless situations in desegregated, and especially in segregated, schools. [14]

A sixth shortcoming in integration in education is the fact that its goal of furthering democratic human relations is not being achieved. Golden notes that "experience has shown that mere integration or racial balance does not automatically produce harmonious relationships between the races." [15] In summing up considerable research on this point, Carithers says that there is a "general agreement that interracial contact per se will not bring about increased tolerance or acceptance." [16] Thus the assumption that interracial contact and interactions will advance democratic human relations and reduce prejudice and discrimination is not valid, unless such contact and interactions are influenced by a democratic school, a compassionate teacher, and other attributes of what we call integrated education.

2. Reasons for the Shortcomings of Integration in Education

The shortcomings of integration in education are undoubtedly attributable to many interrelated causes, but in all probability not to the actual physical mix of different kinds of students, per se. Some of the actual reasons for shortcomings that appear significant are as follows:

a. Insensitive or Obstructionist Decision-makers

Many school authorities who make the key decisions in de-

segregation processes generally are whites who often are untrained to deal with the intricate human engineering implicit and explicit in desegregation. They may also be people who, in varying degrees, are unsympathetic with the theory and process of desegregation. Too often, administrators must respond in a very short period of time to court orders calling for specific percentages of white and black students, teachers, and administrators in certain schools. Without training and sensitivity, a white-administered desegregation program cannot be a shining success. Further, there are those who, for a variety of motives, obstruct or undermine desegregation processes. By themselves, court orders and legal fiat can hardly guarantee that those responsible for implementing those orders are prepared or inclined to perform their duties within the spirit of the ideals of desegregation.

b. Inadequate Integrated Education

I am convinced that the vast majority of schools in the United States suffer from inadequate integrated education and that this is a distinct shortcoming in the South, which is one prominent reason for the shortcomings of integration in education in that part of the nation. The components of quality integrated education--the democratic classroom, the effective and sensitive teacher, a participatory and integrated curriculum, balanced and authentic instructional resources, and good school-home-community relations--are indispensable to advancing democratic human relations through education.

Integrated education of quality is education of quality. Integrated education has as its basic aim, however, the furthering of democratic human relations among students, teachers, and administrators, while quality of

education as such concentrates on improving student achievement. I cannot imagine quality education without integrated education, though many think otherwise. Quality education which excludes integrated education can lead only to a failure of the goals of desegregation and of integration in our schools and society.

We explore more fully in the next section of this paper the inadequacies of integrated education in all kinds of schools in the United States. Suffice it to say here that teachers who are not knowledgeable about the past and present of minority students in the classroom; who are insensitive to their wants, needs, and self-images; who do not expect them to succeed; and who do not let them participate in the educational process, are making integration in education impossible. Other negative attributes of the school, including lily-white textbooks, a white curriculum, and authoritarian school officials, likewise are undermining integration in education. The data are quite clear and ample on this matter.

c. Quality of Whites in Desegregated Schools

Processes leading to desegregation in the South and reducing de facto segregation in the North seem to assume that any kind of white is going to motivate the black or other minority-group member in the desegregated school. It is a shortcoming of integration in education, in my opinion, when this assumption is made. Research and experience have indicated to me that desegregation research and procedures too infrequently look at the subcultures and differences within groups, such as whites, blacks, and others. It is stereotypic and

racist to view the "whites" as possessing some magic ingredient to turn on minority-group members. One ingredient whites do have on the whole is money, and hence good schools, as compared to other groups; and if money can buy good education for whites, it can do the same for the blacks. It is my view, however, and my experience that minority-group members resent the concept of all whites having the mystique for increasing the performance of minority-group students. It is my belief that when those in authority order certain ratios of whites and non-whites to mix in schools and school systems, consideration should be given to the fact that while many white students are good achievers, sensitive to others, and desirous of democratic human relations among all kinds of people, many others are poor school performers, authoritarian, afflicted with mental and physical disabilities, and are just plain bigoted. It is the quality of the person and his interactions with others, not the quantity of whites in any one setting, that will make the difference.

d. Patterns of Resegregation

Eldridge Cleaver feels that integration is decentralized segregation. [17] Others point out that "although black and white children attend school under the same roof in many systems, the roof is literally all they share." [18] A prominent shortcoming of desegregation is resegregation, both imposed and desired.

Imposed segregation in the desegregated schools consists of all the practices, largely contrived by whites, to separate the blacks and other

minority-group students from the whites. Again, the NEA testimony and many other accounts vividly described imposed resegregation of blacks in the South.[19] Observers have cited separate buses for blacks and whites to desegregated schools, separate bus schedules, separate bells for classroom breaks, separate drinking fountains, separate lunch and gym periods, exclusion of blacks from extracurricular activities, denying to blacks symbolic roles of leadership, such as captaincies of football teams and cheerleading, and the most harmful separation of all, the tracking system. With respect to Indian students he studied, Miller concludes that:

> . . . integration is truly in name only, and that within each classroom a segregated situation generally exists. The track system was found in some schools to create classes almost homogeneous racially. Unless some improvement is made in the preparation for, and in the transition of, Indian pupils to integrated schools, such transfer could well be potentially more harmful than helpful to these students.[20]

Desired resegregation means that many blacks in desegregated schools seek to join ranks, have the minimum of interactions with whites, and reinforce one another whenever possible. This indicates a shortcoming--indeed, a failure--of integration in education in the eyes of minority-group students, because the desegregated school, while perhaps offering a better education than the segregated school, is otherwise hostile, white-dominated, and really opposed to the goal of integration in our society.

The salience of the black power movement by 1971 explains to an appreciable degree voluntary black resegregation in schools in all parts of

the nation. The positive attributes of black power, especially in self- and group-concept and mutual reinforcement, have been cited. On the negative side of the coin, voluntary resegregation is also motivated by black distrust of whites and by opposition to white decision making affecting their education. Resegregation is thus also a power movement to influence educational decision making by whites, whether in integrated situations or not. Wilcox puts it this way:

> . . . white men are not worth integrating until they acquire the skills of educating the Black masses to become who they /the Blacks/ want to become. Black men have finally recognized that they can't do any worse, but more importantly, that they alone can convince Black students of their essential worth and educability and at the same time free such students to cope with the realities of a racist society. [21]

Thus resegregation as imposed by whites on minority-group students, teachers, and administrators is profoundly damaging and, indeed, causes blacks to lose trust in white people. It has the effect of the blacks' wanting to resegregate to further the ends they feel are denied to them by whites. Where this occurs, there is a distinct shortcoming of integration in education, anywhere.

One can cite other shortcomings of integration in education, including the patronizing of blacks in some white schools; busing programs that take highly motivated blacks to the suburbs and drain inner-city schools of models that lower-achieving blacks can emulate; court orders that exclude football teams, coaches, and cheerleaders from having to "desegregate"; and so on.

Our central point is not to condemn integration in education but to identify some distinct shortcomings that corrode a great ideal--that students and educators from all walks of life and all groups can and should learn better by learning together and in the spirit of brotherhood. The claim that bringing together under one roof students and educators who are different in race, ethnic background, and nationality is all that is necessary to advance that ideal is a perspective on integration in education unsupported by research or experience.

Integration in education in the South has been brought about by Federal court decisions and orders and thus has generally been imposed on the South. This has been necessary because it would have been decades, if ever, before many southern states took any initiative toward desegregating their schools. Thus de jure segregation in the South is rapidly vanishing, irrespective of the shortcomings of the newly desegregated schools. De facto segregation continues in the North and will come to an end only through court processes. In the North, however, integration in education has been furthered by many towns and cities and by some courageous state legislatures. Thus patterns in integration in education or mixes of students are different in the North and South and in other parts of the nation where different minority groups are located.

It is our finding that all of the points made in this section of the paper apply to most school systems having integration in education, with the exception of the oppressive measures blacks in the South are suffering, such as the demeaning of black teachers and school officials and the separate treatment

of the races in many of the newly desegregated schools. In the vast majority of schools in this nation, the absence or low quality of integrated education precludes any real progress toward integration through education. To this major shortcoming in American education we now turn.

## II. The Inadequacies of Integrated Education in the United States

The process in the schools for preparing young people from all backgrounds, races, ethnic groups, and nationalities to live in an integrated society is the task of integrated education. As we have seen, racial mixes and interactions per se cannot and do not further democratic human relations. The quality and quantity of integrated education in the United States are sadly lacking. We turn to four reasons for the inadequacies of integrated education and then examine the impact of these inadequacies on different kinds of schools in the United States.

### A. Four Dimensions of the Low State of Integrated Education

First, let us note that our critique of integrated education is based upon extensive research and experiences of many working in this field. Let us also note that any generalization has many exceptions, and all of us know of people and conditions in schools throughout the United States that clearly are not within the confines of this critique.

#### 1. Paradoxical Teachers and Teaching

We begin with shortcomings in teachers and teaching, because research now tells us what we knew all along: that the most important single variable in the academic achievement and attitudinal development of the child is the

teacher and the way he or she teaches. Thus it is the teacher more than anything else that can bring about success and failure in the school, to stimulate or retard academic achievement, and to shape positive or negative values and attitudes with respect to differences among people.[22]

The teacher is often a paradox because he or she, however well- or ill-intentioned with respect to advancing democratic human relations in the classroom, is often not prepared to deal with integrated education; is often naïve and insensitive with respect to students who are different in terms of race, ethnic background, or nationality; and is frequently not equipped to use classroom teaching-learning processes that can advance democratic human relations and understanding among students. This is a paradox, because many, if not most, teachers want to contribute toward good intergroup relations, but simply do not feel able or actually do not have the capacity to do so.

a. Preparation of Teachers

One can be brief here. The vast majority of colleges and departments in the nation dealing with teacher preparation do little or nothing to help the prospective teacher to teach about race relations, backgrounds of minority groups, samenesses and differences among human beings, and classroom techniques for helping all kinds of students to overcome prejudices and stereotypes. The same is true for patterns of inservice education, if we take the aggregate of teachers in the United States.

Apparently, the main assumption of educators in these

schools or departments of education, as well as administrators of school systems, is that preservice and inservice teachers require so much education in so many fields that integrated education must take a low priority, if one at all. Others say that integrated education needs only a well-balanced and unbigoted person. We hold, however, that there is much that the teacher should know and much he or she should do in the classroom with respect to education in democratic human relations. Irrespective of the quality of the person, teacher education in this area is essential.

b. Sensitivity and Teachers

Here the data are quite strong, not only with respect to minority-group students but in all-white schools as well. The insensitive, naïve teacher probably does more to damage the minority-group student's image of himself and his chances for achieving in school than any other component of the process of education. [23] Many teachers assume that students are not conscious of their color, ethnic background, or nationality, when all evidence points to the fact that all children, when they enter school, are quite aware of their group identities, especially members of minority groups. [24] Many teachers assume that the classroom is not the place to deal with intergroup relations and interactions, or they fear sanctions from administrators of parents if they do incorporate democratic human relations daily in their classroom procedures. A small number of teachers are so insensitive or even bigoted as to engage in overt discrimination toward minority-group students in the classroom. There is too much

testimony on all these observations to deny that they are true with respect to many teachers. Again, this is not an across-the-board accusation, but rather one's deploring the fact that a great many teachers are insensitive to the human needs of students and to the society's need for integrated education.

c. The Teaching-Learning Process

If the cognitive and affective development of students is to point toward greater understanding of one another, democratic interactions, reduction of stereotypes and of overt discrimination, then the children must be fully engaged in the classroom teaching-learning process. The teacher who lectures to students about being good citizens and loving one's neighbor, the teacher who does not provide for individual or group activities involving inquiry, role playing, and other participatory procedures, is denying to the student the ability to discover things for himself, to relate to others who are different from him, and to begin not to stereotype the behavior of a person because of color, appearance, or background.

In brief, then, where there is inadequate teacher preparation, lack of sensitivity among teachers, and autocratic teaching-learning processes, democratic human relations simply cannot be advanced through education. Indeed, quite the reverse!

2. The Patronizing Curriculum

At best, the structure and content of school curricula are patronizing with respect to minority groups; at worst, the curricula almost completely

ignore relationships between minority groups and the past and present of American society. Research findings indicate that in many desegregated schools, no changes have taken place in the structure of the curriculum. In many instances, no adaptations have been made to accommodate the curriculum to minority-group students, and where desegregation is not taking place, the structure of school curricula for the most part still remains basically white and "Anglo."

Thus the traditional structure continues. Most minority-group students are relegated to lower groups and tracks at all grade levels on the assumption that slow learners are inadequate learners, whereas many slow learners are cautious and careful learners. "If man does not keep pace with his companions," Thoreau tells us, "perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer." And yet in most schools, the "pace of companions" is that demanded by standardized testing and other requirements of the structured curriculum, without regard for the fact that each student and for many reasons responds to a different drummer. How much longer must we continue to make this point?

Tokenism in the structure of the curriculum is also manifest in the bits and pieces about the contributions of minority groups to this nation's past and present, as if those contributions actually were only bits and pieces. The curriculum is segregated into units, courses, and commemorative activities about minority groups as if the role of these groups in American life were sliced in that manner. There might be a sensitive teacher who really incorporates the minority-group experience into the mainstream of the curriculum for students in

grade nine, and then when they go into grade ten, they have a teacher who might ignore that experience entirely. In brief, the structure of school curricula generally perpetuates the myth that minority groups really had little to do with the development of America and are hardly visible today except for the tan-colored kids and the usual heroes.

With respect to the content of the curriculum, the social studies continue to eulogize the great virtues of this nation, its wars and victories, its democratic political development, and its technological supremacy. But John Hope Franklin tells us that:

> The history of the United States is not one great success story and it is not the recounting of the deeds of perfect or near-perfect men. Many of its military triumphs were purchased at a fantastically high price--at the price of segregated armies, discrimination in the treatment of its black soldiers, and the insults by the white civilians of the black men who were giving their lives to protect the whites. Many of the industrial triumphs were purchased at a remarkably high price--at the price of low and discriminatory pay to Negro workers, the inhuman discriminations by labor unions, and the exploitation of defenseless Negro labor that was used only in disputes between management and white unions. Many of its advances in civilization have been purchased at the price of creating a society that is racially exclusive, where housing, education, and even the means of survival have qualifications of race rather than reason or human capabilities. These triumphs, bought at so dear a price, are not the work of perfect or near-perfect men. They are the work of a people curiously insensitive to justice and equality. 25

The content of the curriculum rarely admits contributions by or sacrifices of minority groups. On occasion, as we have noted, the curriculum

does inject minority-group heroes and some of their accomplishments, but it rarely admits that the white society engaged in any discriminatory practices with respect to minority groups. This is why a black claims that "it is racist for white-controlled institutions to agree to set up Black Studies programs without modifying the basic content and form of white-controlled programs." [26]

The omissions of fact and the commissions of error in the content of the curriculum that are damaging to the blacks have been widely recorded. What is less known are the omissions and commissions with respect to Indians, Mexican-Americans and other Spanish-surname Americans, American women, and members of many ethnic and nationality groups. The point is that the content of curricula in American schools has sought to socialize all students into essentially a white society, but that society, in turn, will not generally admit minority-group students to share its values, benefits, and privileges. This procedure for educating young people is no longer being accepted by minority groups, or by many whites as well.

3. Sterile Instructional Materials

In my keynote address to this annual meeting in 1965, I focused most of my remarks on the inadequacies of instructional materials with respect to integrated education. There is little I would change today in my remarks of half a decade ago. In recent months, I have surveyed many elementary-level social studies textbooks, especially in the area of American history, and continue to find them wanting, if they intend to give young people a balanced view of the

American past and present. It is true that some of the children in pictures and drawings are now light tan, and a few have Oriental faces. The only Indians are still, for the most part, the "bad" ones, and we hardly ever see ethnic groups or Spanish-surname children in words or pictures. All of this is sheer tokenism, and it kids no one--especially the kids.

The critique of five years ago continues. Kids identify with the message and not the medium of color--with Cinderella and not light-tan Dick and Jane, irrespective of Dick and Jane's recent demise. (Nevertheless, school systems retain textbooks for a great many years, and thus Dick and Jane will be around for some time to come!) There are still differences between textbooks in the North and South; the books still preach rather than encourage students to inquire; they continue to lock in facts rather than respond to constant changes in our society; and the omissions of fact and commissions of error still amaze even the hardened academic who looks hopefully for change, but does not find it.

Only the other day, I picked up a textbook on American history for third graders. The copyright was 1970, and yet all the old stereotypes were there. You would not believe how the Indians came across as bad guys, how blacks were not introduced into the text until it got into the "plantation period" of American history, and how easily slavery was rationalized in this book for young readers. Pictures could have told the students the many contributions blacks have made to American history, but when we got to inventors, there was not a black around. It was the Anglos--the brave Anglos--who discovered and made America.

The Indians are acknowledged to have been here first, but they did not "discover" America; Columbus did. A black, Estevanico (try to find him in the encyclopaedia!) led an expedition from Mexico to discover Arizona and New Mexico, but he is never in the textbooks. John Cabot, the "English explorer," brought glory to good old England by claiming title in North America for England in 1497, but he is not recognized as the Venetian, Giovanni Caboto. We see nothing about the first permanent settlement in what is now the United States, Sante Fe, which the Spaniards established in 1610.

We all hail the first Thanksgiving of 1621 without really getting the story about how the Pilgrims were totally undemocratic and how they seduced the native Americans, the Indians. A 1969 Playboy cartoon tells the story realistically. A Pilgrim comes to invite a group of Indians to the first Thanksgiving. As he leaves, an Indian says to the others: "They've shot twenty-nine of our braves, polluted all the rivers, killed most of the game and raped the Chief's sister. Now they want us to drop over next Thursday for turkey dinner and all the fixin's." This you most certainly will not find in our textbooks!

As we travel around the country, we snoop into the textbooks in all kinds of schools. We find in affluent suburbs the same omissions and commissions we find in inner cities, in the South, and in the Southwest. We find in an affluent suburb in a fourth-grade book the only picture of blacks, and it is one of a monkey dressed up as a mother who is holding her black monkey child. We find in a desegregated (in bodies only) school in the South a music book in which

other nationalities and groups have their music represented. For Africa, we have two pages of inane songs and a light-colored monkey with a crew haircut. In the Southwest, we found Indians engaged in a crazy dance around a teepee in a third-grade book about communities, and several pictures of what we took to be Mexicans asleep beside a tree and shaded by their sombreros. In all these textbooks, however, the whites are in their shining glory in all steps of life. Usually it is only in social studies texts that we find any mention of minority groups.

We do not see free blacks before the 1860's, only slaves. We do not see the Chinese building our railroads; Jews establishing great merchandising enterprises or the fiscal foundations of our nation; Germans, Scandinavians, and Eastern Europeans developing our prairies; the Irish and Italians shaping the destinies of our cities; and the contributions of so many other immigrants contributing to the richness and diversity of our nation. What we generally see is an America shaped by the Anglo-whites and usually a total absence or tokenism with respect to the blacks, the Indians, and Spanish-speaking Americans. We are not demeaning the Anglos for their sacrifices or their courageous contributions to our nation's past, but we do ask for equal time for all. Reading our textbooks would lead us to believe that the Anglos were not immigrants, but all others were. If you do not believe this, read sections of textbooks about the immigrants. The Anglos are not there!

An old Indian chief came to see President Grant one day and was asked by the President if he could offer any advice on the basis of his vast

experience. The chief could only say, "Sir, I only hope you get more strict on your immigration laws than we were." President Franklin D. Roosevelt addressed the Daughters of the American Revolution in 1933 and opened his remarks with, "Fellow immigrants." A thunderous silence enveloped "Independence Hall." And so goes American history.

Other observers find little change in instructional resources with respect to our diverse society. In 1969, Dorothy Sterling examined about all the available literary anthologies for high school students, including 38 books from 12 leading publishers. All of these volumes were published after 1954 and most in the middle or late 1960's. Of the 38, 27 contained no material at all by or about American Negroes, and the others carried one or two selections apiece. There were five African writings--by whites--and all referred to safari boys, pony boys, lion boys, and so on. John Greenleaf Whittier was there, but not his antislavery poems; and Stephen Vincent Benét was there, but not his John Brown's Body. Charles Dickens was there, but not his attacks on slavery in his American Notes. [27]

Or take the situation in the Detroit Public Schools in 1968. The textbook selection committee, charged with the evaluation of instructional resources for treatment of minorities, rejected all but 15 out of several hundred textbooks submitted to the committee. Publishers quickly responded to the committee's session explaining and documenting reasons for rejections, and many changes were made by publishers so that their materials might be considered

favorably. Reasons for rejections are those we have cited many times: inadequate treatment of minorities; obvious commissions of error and omissions of fact; stereotyped minority heroes and characters; patronizing treatment of groups; inclusion of minority groups in social studies texts, but complete absence of such groups in other academic areas; lack of candor about white prejudice and discrimination; and all the rest. [28]

The Detroit group readily discovered that the publishers would respond quickly and make changes if a large market demanded such changes. This is an important point. It is useless to condemn the publishers of instructional resources for neglecting integrated education and retarding its objectives without condemning as well the people who continue to purchase these materials. The publishers, after all, are in the game for profits, and they sell to a market that determines the content of their products. Unless more school systems do what Detroit has done and refuse to serve as a market for instructional materials damaging to all kinds of students and for the obvious reasons, then little will change in this important area of integrated education.

4. Silent Administrators

Integrated education continues to suffer from virtual silence by many principals, superintendents, and other administrators who feel that initiative in the direction of integrated education is not their responsibility. The silent administrator thus cannot or will not provide reinforcement to the enterprising teacher who may wish to engage in integrated education in the classroom, but will

not do so without support from his or her superiors. The silent administrator does not assume courageous leadership in changing the curriculum to meet the needs of integrated education. He continues to purchase instructional resources that perpetuate the same old and vicious racism in messages communicated to students. He or she will not spend money on the necessary programs of inservice teacher education for advancing enlightenment, sensitivity, and effective teaching practices. Silent administrators will also refrain from encouraging parents of minority-group students to reinforce in the home their children's work in the schools.

In brief, many silent administrators see their first obligation as maintaining law and order in the schools; and their second, complying with the usual school board or committee's desire to keep "sensitive" issues out of the school and classroom. Silence means, in other words, not rocking the boat, but if someone does not rock the boat, it most surely will sink. We hail, of course, the many fine school administrators who are not silent and who play an active and creative role in bringing integrated education to their schools and school systems.

B. Impact of Inadequate Integrated Education on the Schools

The low state of integrated education certainly has a profound impact on schools where integration in education is taking place, and on schools where, for one reason or another, there is no mixing of white and minority-group students.

1. Schools With Integration in Education

In desegregated schools in the South and in schools in other parts of the nation where there are various kinds of mixes between whites and blacks, as well as members of other minority groups, the impact of inadequate integrated education is felt by all students. For whites, the messages continue to be reassuring and ego-supportive in that white supremacy in terms of teaching, curriculum, instructional materials, and administration is as strong as ever. Some compassionate white students protest against this situation, but with little effect. Among the blacks and other minority-group students, cynicism grows as does the credibility gap, even though many of these students desire a closer relationship through the process of education with their white fellow students.

For all concerned students, as well as concerned teachers and administrators, questions arise. They arise about the dichotomy between policy that demands school desegregation in the South and "racial balance" elsewhere on the one hand, and the inadequacies of integrated education in the classroom teaching-learning process on the other.

The minority-group members in particular see a credibility gap between mixes of students in the schools and the perpetuation of white supremacy and minority-group derogation through the inadequacies of teachers and teaching, the curriculum, instructional resources, and silent administrators. If integrated education does not take integration through education seriously, then why the emphasis on mixing all kinds of groups in the schools? The spirit of integration

in 1965 has been radically altered by black power in the six years between 1965 and 1971, and if we all are to celebrate the "Spirit of 1776" in 1976, will the situation then be any different?

2. Schools Where Segregation Remains

There is even greater cynicism, as well as damage to students in segregated schools, with respect to the inadequacies of integrated education. The Chicanos or Mexican-Americans suffer from these inadequacies and are increasingly objecting to white teachers, curricula, instructional resources, and administrators. [29] The same is true for American Indians, [30] many white-ethnic groups, and Spanish-speaking Americans. They suffer from a negative self-concept fomented by poor integrated education and from the self-fulfilling prophecy of low expectation, which leads to low achievement and thus to poor life options and opportunities. [31] Inadequate integrated education leads to polarization in our society, a condition that inevitably produces protest and violence in the schools and in society.

3. White Schools

Children in all-white schools or in those schools where there are only a few students from minority groups perhaps are even more adversely affected by inadequate integrated education, whether they know it or not. These students tend to be in the middle or upper classes in socio-economic status and are destined to be the elite of tomorrow. Their self-assurance and conviction of natural dominance in society render them insensitive to the demands and expectations of

their fellow Americans in the minority groups, and thus the cycle of white-Anglo supremacy is perpetuated by poor integrated education. Alice Miel's The Shortchanged Children of Suburbia [32] provides ample testimony for this statement. One can only deeply regret that the absence or low quality of integrated education in essentially all-white schools leads to naïveté about the richness of variety in our society, about the demands and expectations of minority groups, and about the real nature of diversity in our nation and the world.

In brief, then, the poor state of integrated education inevitably leads to polarization on all sides, and unless we produce in our schools integrated education of quality, all other measures to advance integration through education--as we have said so many times--will ultimately fail.

III. Toward Quality in Education

If education is to serve our children well, it must be of the highest possible quality, anywhere. If education is to help to advance an integrated society, it must be permeated with all the components of integrated education of the highest quality, anywhere.

A. Quality School Services and Processes

It is my belief that many if not most members of minority groups seek education of quality for their children wherever and whenever they can find it. I believe they value quality education higher than integration in education, although most still prefer a combination of both.

James Farmer declares that "our objective should be to provide

high-quality education. The real problem is not integration or segregation. It is the quality of education." [33] Boston City Councilman, Thomas Atkins, makes these points:

> I have never believed, personally, that integration in a school is more important, is the most important thing. I am not . . . willing to say that integration is more important than a good teacher or a good curriculum. An integrated classroom with a bad curriculum is going to be miseducation. . . . /Children/ must learn where you get them and that doesn't depend on integration. It depends on the quality of your teaching staff and on your teaching program. [34]

Congresswoman Edith Green notes that what Negro parents "are entitled to is quality education for their children in the area in which they live." [35] One could cite at length similar statements by minority-group members and leaders as well as by sensitive white persons.

It is true that seeking to give all children quality education, irrespective of integrated or nonintegrated situations, may be construed as racist, because it can be alleged that this really is an argument for the continuation of de jure or de facto segregation. All I can say is that people of good will from all sorts of groups are increasingly making the same kinds of statements, and these people, as well as I, plead for integration in education, quality in education, and quality integrated education. The point is that we do not believe that quality in education for minority-group students can be found only in desegregated or integrated schools.

There are some blacks and other minority-group members who take

a more extreme position on this point and feel that it is impossible for their students to have any education of quality outside of their own schools. Chester Davis, Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of the Black World in Atlanta, claims that:

> . . . it is not useful to continue to chase this dream of integrated schools. Pursuit of this dream means continually chasing white people, who in turn will continue to run. . . . The question, then, for Black people, is not one of "integration" versus "segregation." It is control. An all-Black school is not "inherently inferior" as was pronounced in the 1954 Brown decision. The quality of education which goes on in such schools will be determined by the people who run it, and . . . the people who run it should be the Black communities themselves. [36]

Parenthetically, there are many excellent black or nearly all-black schools in all parts of the United States that certainly defy the Supreme Court's finding of 1954. Sixth graders in the Windsor Hills School in Los Angeles, which has a 90% minority-student population, had the highest I.Q. of all sixth grades in the 435 elementary schools in the Los Angeles district in 1969. Windsor Hills also tied third with four other schools in reading scores. The School is in an upper-class area; however, the quality of education there, in addition to support and reinforcement of the children by their parents, certainly proves that high pupil achievement does not necessitate the presence of white children. [37]

We urge, then, a major national investment in quality of education wherever children are, and we have reached the point where we are much more certain than ever before what quality in education is. [38] That national investment certainly should encourage integration in education to join quality in education,

but we still hold that it is quality in education that is the most vital need of all children, anywhere, provided there is quality in integrated education as well.

B. Quality in Integrated Education

Again, we claim that whether students are in desegregated or integrated schools, or in basically homogeneous school environments, the absence of quality integrated education renders the goals of an integrated society virtually impossible. Chesler reminds us that we cannot depend on "doing what comes naturally . . . too much of what is natural in American race relations is distrustful and separatist: desegregation itself is a departure from our natural social patterns, and other breaks with tradition are vital. "[39]

Our proposals for quality integrated education are based not only on considerable research and empirical findings but also on the extensive work we have done at the Lincoln Filene Center in research, development of instructional resources, teacher education, teaching in the schools, and dissemination in intergroup relations education. The Center's Intergroup Relations Curriculum and its Intergroup Relations Seminars for teachers, originally supported by the United States Office of Education, have given us many years of experience in this vital field. The two main things we are beginning to learn is how to ask the right questions, and how much more we have to learn.[40] We still plead, however, for quality integrated education, anywhere, and for the following six components of what we consider quality integrated education to be.

1. The Democratic School

The democratic school is one oriented toward the needs of students. It stresses education rather than schooling. The child is respected and loved. There is flexibility in the curriculum, a low pupil-adult ratio in the classroom, and an appraisal of achievement based on the student's maximizing his own potential rather than his being judged on the basis of standardized tests.

The democratic school is characterized by the other components of quality education and quality integrated education that we cite below. Research findings in desegregated schools show that the goals of desegregation are generally unattainable without this kind of school. Denmark and Guttentag find that "A good, creative, enjoyable learning climate may be more important than the specific composition of the /desegregated school/ experience." [41] Is it not time to put these findings and good common sense to work in our schools?

2. Quality Teachers and Teaching

Guthrie and others identify the teacher and teaching as the most important variable in helping students to achieve or in causing them to fail, and Rosenthal and others provide us with research findings about the tremendous impact teachers can have on self-concept and motivation to learn. [42] The preservice and inservice training of teachers thus becomes the most important need of quality integrated education, and it is here that the major investment must be made if we ever are to have integrated education of quality. We can cite abundant research to support this statement.

There is little we can say about preservice education except to plead with those who make decisions in our teacher-training institutions to read the research and empirical findings about the vital need to prepare our teachers for integrated education. The vast decentralization of these institutions makes it exceedingly difficult to make this plea a reality. Decision makers with respect to inservice teacher education are, however, responding to this need, which we see as three-fold: training to develop enlightened, sensitive, and effective teachers.

a. The Enlightened Teacher

Anyone should be "enlightened." Our meaning of the enlightened teacher with respect to integrated education is that he or she should be knowledgeable about many aspects of intergroup relations in the United States. This includes the background of minority groups and their experiences and deprivations in American life, past and present. A realistic understanding of American history is essential, as well as acquaintance with current movements among minority groups today, such as black power and the quest for identity and pride among other minority groups.

The enlightened teacher should know how children acquire racial attitudes and stereotypes. He or she should know that very early in life children develop racial awareness and attach values to that awareness. As Carithers points out, the child does not approach school or any integrated situation in vacuo. [43] It is the parent who molds these attitudes initially, and later the peer group.

Racial awareness comes earlier and is much more acute among minority-group children, who continue, for the most part, to place a higher value on "nice" whiteness than "bad" blackness. The teacher should know the profound differences within minority-group cultures, that minority-group girls are more threatened than boys in integrated situations, and much more in the social dynamics of intergroup relations. [44]

To meet the needs of integrated education, the teacher needs enlightenment in many areas, because his or her previous education probably has ignored the entire realm of intergroup relations. Nevertheless, the kind of enlightenment essential to qualitative integrated education can be learned in a relatively short period of time, providing there is a desire on the part of the teacher and support by administrators and other decision makers.

b. The Sensitive Teacher

"Enlightenment" is not enough; integrated education requires a sensitive person as well. This does not mean a "sensitized" person or involve the kind of sensitivity training that runs to acrobatics, blindfolds, and physical interactions. By the sensitive teacher, we mean one who loves children, who expects them to succeed as learners, who is quite aware of students' feelings about the groups to which they belong, and who at all times bolsters the child's image of and respect for himself. Again, research and empirical findings tell us how many children are damaged by the insensitive teacher, especially in the area of self-concept and in teachers' not expecting children to learn well. This same

research, on the other side of the coin, tells us that the sensitive teacher can do much with respect to motivating students, to advancing positive self-esteem, and to providing emotional encouragement to students.

The data show that the sensitive teacher is particularly important to black and other minority-group students. Geisel puts it this way:

> The teacher for the white child is likely to be simply an instrumental agent of the school. For the Negro child, she also represents a status position and a respected social role. . . . The Negro child who feels he is important in the eyes of the teacher is optimistic about the future and also thinks education is very important. [45]

The warm and humane person is undoubtedly a sensitive person as well. But there are dimensions of intergroup relations requiring a sensitivity that does not come naturally. While many adults might be immune from any attempts to help them to gain a basic sensitivity to the needs of children, it is our conviction that training programs can make a significant contribution toward such sensitivity.

c. The Effective Teacher

By effective, we mean a teacher who engages students in the teaching-learning process and who genuinely seeks out all opportunities for participatory activities by students. Discovery, role playing, individual and group projects, simulation, improvization, and many other styles of classroom participation are essential in helping students to understand themselves and others and to value their abilities to become better learners.

In drawing from the research findings of Carithers, it is important to note that children are members of groups and subgroups and that attitudes and perceptions toward self and others are determined by membership in those groups. Thus classroom participatory activities that mix children up into many different kinds of groups and role playing within and among groups help to reduce stereotypes about themselves and others. Conversely, the stereotypes pupils bring into the school and the perceptions they have about themselves as members of groups are hardly going to be altered by an autocratic and preaching teacher and a classroom in which children have no opportunity genuinely to interact with one another. [46]

The effective as well as sensitive teacher must also be able to deal with children's emotions and problems, with their fears and their prejudices. All of this is in the affective domain, and there are those who claim that teachers and schools should not deal with such sensitive matters. But furthering democratic intergroup relations in the classroom does require affective processes to reach the affective dimension of the child, and teachers must be trained to use such processes in their daily classroom activity.

Our years of experience at the Lincoln Filene Center in teacher training in intergroup relations education convince us that, irrespective of how well educated a teacher is or what a fine person he is, the needs of quality integrated education cannot be met by assuming that no training at all is necessary. The enlightened, sensitive, and effective teacher can be developed through

training programs, and it is here that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would be well advised to allocate a significant portion of the some $1,500,000,000 it intends to spend during the coming year on school desegregation in the United States.

3. The Integrated Curriculum

The structure of the integrated curriculum should not be characterized by the bits and pieces about minority groups that we cited earlier. Minority groups are an integral part of American history and should occupy their due place in whatever part of that history their contributions, their hardships and deprivations, and their achievements occurred. I am in general against units, courses, and special commemorative programs such as Black History Week, because these segregated parts of the curriculum and school program only perpetuate segregation in education. For some minority groups, emphasis on special courses, units, and programs may well be necessary to bolster their self-respect and understanding of themselves and their groups. Nevertheless, we still seek an authentic and realistic curriculum that has room for all that is relevant, but less room for so many of the irrelevant courses and units of subject matter that have little to do with the present and future lives of our young people.

It follows, then, that the content of the curriculum also should be fully integrated, grades K through 12. It should be integrated in written and pictorial material, in music, the arts, the sciences, mathematics, and all other subject areas. Nathan Hare points out that in mathematics, black children are

required to learn their numbers with middle-class referents, such as stocks and bonds or the flight of planes. He suggests a "black math" that might address itself to this problem: "If a cockroach is running at one mile an hour and a rat is running at 15 miles an hour, at what time T will cockroach A meet rat B?" [47] This, indeed, would be relevant for all students!

John Hope Franklin again has words of wisdom for us:

> It will take much more than new books, new authorities, and new programs of study to achieve a really new and urgently needed approach to the study and teaching of the history of Negro Americans. What is needed by all who would teach and write in this field is a new way of looking at the history of the United States and a new way of teaching about what has happened to this nation since its beginnings. The history of the United States is not merely the history of a few generals, a few Presidents, a few planters, and a few industrialists. It is a history of all the people, rich and poor, exalted and humble, black and white and yellow. And all of these people have been human beings, not subhuman or pariahs, but people worthy of the blessings of liberty and the rights of equality. All of them have been involved in the history of this country in every way, at every step, even if the role they played was by assignment and not by choice.

Franklin urges that the realities of discrimination likewise be included in the new history:

> If the Patriots were more in love with slavery than freedom, if the Founding Fathers were more anxious to write slavery into the Constitution than they were to protect the rights of men, and if freedom was begrudgingly given and then effectively denied for another century, these things too are a part of the nation's history. . . . and when this approach prevails, the history of the United States and the history of black men can be written and taught by any person, white, black, or otherwise. For there is nothing so irrelevant in telling the truth as the color of a man's skin. [48]

On the other hand, there is nothing so irrelevant as whites presuming to teach and write a realistic history of this nation without relating in many ways to minority-group experiences that can only be expressed by members of those minority groups. That is why authorship of a realistic American history must be a cooperative enterprise, with inputs by scholars from all the minority groups along with white specialists.

If teachers cannot find instructional materials that genuinely weave into the curriculum the minority-group experience of yesterday and today, there are many resources on which they can draw to do the job themselves. [49] It is to be hoped, however, that writers and publishers will join forces to develop the kind of history Franklin calls for, and that teachers will be provided with all kinds of instructional resources and programs to make the content of the curriculum realistically reflect the richness of American diversity as well as the realities of intergroup relations in our society.

Finally, we cannot stress too strongly the importance of the elementary school years in the affective and attitudinal development of the child. It is thus the elementary school curriculum that must deal with intergroup relations in a most effective manner. We simply cannot wait until the child enters junior or senior high school to introduce intergroup relations into the curriculum on the grounds that he or she will be more mature and ready to handle sensitive matters in the later school years. We say again that the child has already begun to develop attitudes and even stereotypes toward race and color before he enters school.

If the schools do not do something about this through quality integrated education, one can be certain that the brand of intergroup relations that generally takes place outside the school will hardly help the cause of integration in our society. [50]

4. Authentic Instructional Resources

It is quite clear that the publishers have heard our messages over the years, judging from the advertisements about black studies programs and materials in all journals reaching social studies teachers. Although most other segments of the curriculum have not been provided with integrated instructional materials, at least the social studies teacher can select from a wide variety of resources, books, and media that deal with the black (and to a lesser extent other minority-group) experiences in American life.

Certainly, our critique above of the current status of instructional resources suggests many ways in which they can be improved. As with the structure of the curriculum, the main need is a thorough integration of all minority groups into the content of social studies textbooks and also the integration of these groups into other academic areas as well, kindergarten through grade 12. Unfortunately, many of the current offerings of the publishers in black studies are designed to supplement or "enrich," rather than to be used as an integral part of the curriculum. Thus it remains for the teachers to weave these materials into the curriculum, as well as other resource material that is available in many places.

We also urge that students should develop individual instructional

portfolios in which they write their names, put stories about themselves and their families, and add other things of interest to them. They can collect pictures and take some of their own, and can find many other items to go into the portfolios that deal with themselves, groups, interactions, and the other areas of human relations. In effect, they are developing their own instructional materials, and in terms of discovery, self-esteem, and uses of the community at large as an environment for learning, the concept of the student-oriented portfolio is highly recommended.

Finally, we feel strongly that school systems should apply careful content analysis to the instructional resources they purchase so that these resources are as integrated as possible. Weinberg and others provide solid guidelines for such analysis. Again, it is not how many pictures of minority-group children or how many black heroes are shown in the books that count, but the real story of America, even when it hurts.

5. Vigorous Support from the School Administration

Our experiences at the Lincoln Filene Center, those of many others, and research findings all point to the fact that quality integrated education rarely will materialize unless school officials support the democratic classroom, effective inservice training for teachers, an integrated curriculum, and authentic instructional resources. Administrators must provide reinforcement for teachers who are engaged in intergroup relations education, must procure the resources necessary for training programs, and must supervise the purchase of instructional materials.

We have found that members of communities who elect members of school committees to whom, in turn, administrators are responsible are most effective in persuading the committees to provide support for effective school administration. Thus we turn to the community at large for the political and moral foundations for changing school systems. This suggests that teachers and all of us should not hesitate to mobilize community support for quality education and quality integrated education. We hear much about accountability these days. If the term means anything, it should mean that all educational decision makers, especially school administrators, must be accountable to the clients they serve, including the students, for the efficacy of their decisions, especially in integrated education.

6. Community-Family-School Relations

The school and the educators within it must relate to the families of students and especially do whatever they can to reinforce disadvantaged students who may get little or no reinforcement in the home. The process of education takes place far more outside the school than within, and the family, especially in the attitudinal development of the child, is a powerful educational force irrespective of how informal that force may be.

We encourage teachers to involve parents as much as possible in the class program in integrated education, especially through the medium of the student's instructional portfolio, which can often be taken home. We usually find that when parents understand what is taking place in integrated education in the

classroom, they will tend to support that activity, but certainly lines of communication should be kept open and busy. [51]

A community supportive of quality integrated education in the schools also reduces the likelihood of challenges to what the school seeks to do for and with students in this area. An open approach to school programs, with open school doors to the community, using the community as an environment for student learning and inquiry, and information about intergroup relations programs in the media, all help to guarantee success for such programs.

In brief, all the components of quality integrated education are interrelated, although we believe the single most important ingredient is the enlightened, sensitive, and effective teacher. We also believe that the single most important investment for advancing quality integrated education is in the inservice training of teachers. We hold, finally, that these components of integrated education can and should be found in any class and any school, and we hope that where and when possible, that class and school will be integrated in every respect as well.

IV. Schools, Society, and Integration

Ideally, our task is to work toward quality in education, integration in education, and integrated education in all our schools. We shall never attain the ultimate ideal, but at least the ideal gives us directions, helps to determine appropriate strategies in education, and permits us to evaluate what we are doing with

respect to the students. If these styles of education were more fully embraced in our schools--and it is our obligation to see that this is done--our students would benefit in many ways as learners and as responsible members of a democratic society.

It is abundantly clear that many assume the school to be the prime societal institution to advance democratic human relations in our society, to develop patterns of behavior for reducing prejudice, and to guide overt behaviors in the direction of bringing an end to man's discrimination against fellow man. Unless, however, there is concerted action to reduce prejudice and discrimination in other societal institutions, especially in business and employment, housing, and recreation, integration in education and integrated education simply cannot serve their ideal ends.

Policy at all levels of government, fortunately, is pushing for integration in education and integrated education, although we wish the pace were faster. At the same time, however, all levels of government are moving much too slowly in reducing overt discrimination in many other walks of national life. The young person who, through the process of education, is encouraged to have a positive image of himself, not to misjudge and prejudge the behaviors of others, and to refrain from any acts of discrimination, may well tend to view that encouragement fallacious when in the real world he is demeaned, the butt of prejudice, and the object of discrimination in many areas. To put the matter another way, gaps between democratic human relations in the schools and behaviors in housing, employment, and other

areas of society produce in the minds of young people a cynicism and that could undermine all the work the schools are seeking to do in advancing democratic human relations.

It is the real world that counts in the long run, and the schools and education have a mission to prepare young people for an effective and happy life in that real world. If the schools, in that process of preparation, focus much of their energies on democratic human relations, and if those young people cannot enact those relations in all walks of national life, the schools cannot serve their intended purpose in this area. The minority-group student who is exposed to fine patterns of integrated education in the school and then returns home to the ghetto, where he is the object of all kinds of discrimination, must surely question the value of what the schools are saying and doing. All the fine oratory of educators, the dicta of Federal court judges, and others who exhort and demand the schools to bring about an integrated society will thus have little effect.

This is a plea, then, to those in authoritative positions in governments, who expect the schools to be the primary vehicle for building a better America, to realize that the schools must be joined by other societal institutions in furthering that mission.

V. The Road Ahead

Aside from the recommendations we have put forward thus far, I should like to add four further suggestions for advancing democratic human relations through education. Joe R. Feagin, among others, has shown that public opinion does support

more courageous measures for integration through education, although that opinion has not expressed itself to any strong degree as yet. He calls for leadership and change and puts the matter this way!

> . . . the challenge for those involved in education seems clear. Many educators are in positions where they could take a much more aggressive stand on the causes of, and solutions to, America's basic problems. Timidity is not the need of the hour. We have for too long complained about the lack of public support for this or that issue and have abdicated the role of generating public support and shaping public opinion with regard to new ways of dealing with educational problems. The existing support for such programs is at this point only potential and latent. The basic American crisis may not be a "troubled white majority" as much as a failure of leadership on the part of those Americans with the greatest access to the resources which might solve this country's problems. [52]

If, then, we believe in what research, empirical findings, and experiences tell us of what can be done to improve integration through education, leadership is the need of the hour. Leadership in four areas is the challenge before us.

A. Using What We Think We Know

The available research, empirical findings, and experiences in integration in education, in integrated education, and in quality education must be translated from the books and the limited places where great things are taking place to class-

rooms in America. This is particularly the case, in my opinion, with respect to the components of quality integrated education outlined in Section III of this paper. Goodlad and Klein, among others, point to the tremendous gaps between educational innovations and actual practices and recommend, more than anything else, a complete revamping in preservice and inservice teacher education to bring these innovations directly to children. We could not agree more. [53]

We do, of course, need more research in all these areas. I feel that much of the research prior to 1965 should be carefully reviewed, because the black power movement and other movements that have given so much strength to minority groups and their members have changed many of the empirical findings of the early 1960's. This is particularly the case in the area of the self-concept. [54] The Coleman findings, published in 1966, fortunately are being reviewed carefully, and I trust the critiques of the Coleman study also will be carefully examined by those who take Coleman's findings to be accurate and conclusive. [55] We need action research in the classroom and by many kinds of researchers, not just the white academics, some of whom haven't really had much exposure to the classroom or the real stuff of education. [56] We must also draw upon findings from performance-contract projects that deal with innovative inputs into all kinds of schools. Findings from the project in the Banneker Elementary School in Gary, Indiana, conducted by the Behavioral Research Laboratories, will, I predict, tell us much about what can work well to advance inner-city black childrens' academic performance, and contribute to a positive self-concept as well.

In brief, then, let us put to work what we think we know is going well in the schools, and let's keep on finding out what can work, not through scholarly studies but through close work with children, teachers, and administrators in the schools.

B. Implementing and Accounting with Respect to Integration Through Education

I believe that if Federal court orders concerning desegregation processes and policy directives by other governmental officials at all levels include demands on school systems to accompany such processes with components of quality integrated education, especially teacher inservice training, the goals of desegregation can be greatly enhanced. This is saying what we have said before, that desegregation not accompanied by enlightened and sensitive teaching, an integrated curriculum, and integrated instructional materials, and other aspects of quality integrated education, can hardly achieve its ends. A court order calling on a city school system to have a certain percentage of black pupils and white pupils in X number of specific schools, but not requiring anything else to make that particular mix lead toward democratic human relations among children and teachers, may well accomplish nothing and may even lead to patterns of resegregation and degrees of racial polarization. We must be insistent on having integrated education accompany integration in education!

If we have a marriage between integration in education and integrated education, we must then call on educational decision makers at all levels to give an

accounting to the publics they serve, including students, for the measures they are taking to advance quality in education and democratic human relations in the schools. What about inservice training of teachers? What about the kinds and varieties of instructional materials dealing with an integrated society? What about advances in self-concept and the means teachers use to encourage students to learn and learn well? What about administrators' reinforcing teachers who need support for bringing about innovations in the classroom? It is not enough to introduce change in education. It is necessary to make certain that change really is taking place and to call upon those responsible for change to give an accounting of what they are or are not doing.

C. Whites and Integration Through Education

It is time that we got away from the concept that the main people who will benefit from integration through education are black students and other members of minority groups. Whites need integration as much as minority group members, if not more. Whites who have little or no integrated education will be young people who, as adults, will continue to have the same attitudes toward minority groups and to discriminate against them as did the generations before them. Dr. Kenneth B. Clark makes this incisive point:

> The argument for desegregation of our public schools must therefore be presented in terms of the damage which racially segregated

> schools and racism as a whole imposes upon the privileged white children. There is strong evidence to suggest that racial segregation--the institutionalization of racism--is flagrantly and insidiously detrimental to white children as well as black.

He adds that the United States will never effectively desegregate its schools or combat racism so long as it views these problems in terms of their damage to Negroes and Negro children. [57] This is one reason, among many, why integrated education is so essential in basically all-white schools.

D. Desegregation and the North

Ending of de facto segregation in the North will not substantially materialize unless the Federal courts take appropriate action and/or unless legislation is passed by the United States Congress along the lines suggested by Senator Abraham Ribicoff, requiring all schools in a metropolitan area to be integrated under a single, locally developed plan to be implemented over a period of ten years. Senator Ribicoff also calls for requiring suburban communities receiving federally aided installations to provide for housing for low- and moderate-income families. [58]

On the matter of de facto segregation in the North, the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and the "equal protection of the laws" clause appear to me to be significant points to be stressed. A child in a school that is racially segregated and one having demonstrably poor quality in school services and processes is a child who is not guaranteed equal protection of the law by the state government. Guthrie and his associates, as well as many others, make this point, and we should continue to emphasize it and to use the courts to help make

education indeed guarantee equal protection of the law. [59]

On the matter of metropolitan school districts and better relating suburbia to the inner city, I feel that Senator Ribicoff's legislation merits strong support. I do not feel that programs of busing inner-city students to the suburbs ever will be the real answer to de facto segregation or that other well-intentioned programs to alleviate de facto segregation in the inner city will do what they are expected to. [60] The concept of the metropolitan school district must have our earnest support, along with providing means, through low- and moderate-cost housing, for inner-city residents to get away from their city ghettos.

This only reinforces the point that discrimination in our society cannot be ended solely through the schools. All societal institutions must share in the process of ending discrimination in housing and employment. These are the critical areas, along with the schools, for advancing that goal.

One is tempted to go on and on. There is much more to say and do. But more cannot be said and more cannot be done unless we feel that we really can help to make the schools and education, as well as other societal institutions, move toward the ideals of democracy and democratic human relations. If we join forces in this endeavor, then we can share the dream of Martin Luther King, Jr., which he articulated so beautifully shortly before the tragic ending of his life:

> And so I can still sing, although many have stopped singing it, "We shall overcome." We shall overcome because the arch of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice. We shall over-

come because Carlyle is right, "No lie can live forever." We shall overcome because William Cullen Bryant is right, "Truth crushed to earth will rise again." We shall overcome because James Russell Lowell is right, "Truth forever on the scaffold, wrong forever on the throne, yet that scaffold sways a future." And so with this faith, we will be able to hew out of the mountain of despair a stone of hope. We will be able to transform the jangling discords of our nation into a beautiful symphony of brotherhood. This will be a great day. This will not be the day of the white man, it will not be the day of the black man, it will be the day of man as man.

## References


1. Meyer Weinberg, Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1970, p. 3.

2. Ibid., p. 2.

3. Integrated Education, February and March, 1965, p. 9.

4. Weinberg, op. cit., p. 303.

5. It may be of value to set forth the latest available figures (1968) on ethnic-group students in American schools:

| | |
|---|---|
| White | 34,697,133 |
| Negro | 6,282,173 |
| Spanish-surnamed | 2,002,776 |
| American Indian | 177,464 |
| Oriental | 194,022 |

6. Leon Friedman (ed.), Argument. New York: Chester House, 1970, p. xliv.

7. Irwin Katz, Desegregation or Integration in Public Schools? The Policy Implications for Research, unpublished paper prepared for the National Conference on Equal Educational Opportunity in America's Cities, sponsored by the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967, p. 26. See also, Stanley P. Matzen, The Relationship Between Racial Composition and Scholastic Achievement in Elementary School Classrooms, unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1965 (University Microfilms Order No. 66-2518).

8. James Guthrie, et al., Schools and Inequality. New York: Urban Coalition, 1969.

9. James S. Coleman, et al., Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1966, p. 325.

10. See Weinberg, op. cit., pp. 68, 71, 73, 84, 114, 129.

11. See Time, July 13, 1970, p. 32.

12. For testimony of the Delta Ministry, see Inequality in Education, No. 5, Center for Law and Education, Harvard University, June 30, 1970, pp. 13, 14.

13. Clifton M. Claye, "Problems of Cross-Over Teachers," Integrated Education: Race and Schools, September-October, 1970, pp. 3 ff.

14. "Ralph Nader Comments on Indian Education," Integrated Education: Race and Schools, November-December, 1969, pp. 3 ff., and William Penseno, "Nothing But Death," Ibid., p. 17.

15. Paul C. Goldin, "A Model for Racial Awareness in Training of Teachers in Integrated Schools," Ibid., January-February, 1970, p. 62.

16. Martha W. Carithers, "School Desegregation and Racial Cleavage, 1954-1970: A Review of the Literature," The Journal of Social Issues, Autumn, 1970, p. 41, and also Edward C. Clawson, A Study of Attitudes of Prejudice Against Negroes in an All-White Community, doctoral dissertation, Graduate School, The Pennsylvania State University, June, 1968.

17. Cited in Integrated Education: Race and Schools, July 1969, p. 16.

18. Inequality in Education, op. cit., p. 14.

19. See References 11 and 12.

20. Harold J. Miller, The Effects of Integration on Rural Indian Pupils, doctoral dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1968, pp. 97, 99.

21. Preston Wilcox (President of the Afro-American Educators Association), "Integration or Separatism in Education: K-12," Integrated Education: Race and Schools, January-February, 1970, p. 33.

22. Guthrie, op. cit., Chapter Four, "School Services and Pupil Performance."

23. The data on how teachers damage self-concept are quite strong, as is revealed in a content analysis of Weinberg's Desegregation Research: An Appraisal. See also William C. Kvaraceus, et al., Negro Self-Concept: Implications for Schools and Citizenship. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1965.

24. See Carithers, op. cit., p. 26.

25. "The Future of Negro American History," The First Annual Martin Luther King, Jr., Memorial Lecture, New School for Social Research, April 3, 1969.

26. Wilcox, op. cit., p. 24.

27. Dorothy Sterling, "What's Black and White and Read All Over?" The English Journal, September, 1969.

28. Malorie Edelson, "What About Us?: How Textbooks Treat Minorities," Educational Product Report, November, 1969, pp. 6 ff.

29. Julian Nava, "Who Is the Chicano?" Integrated Education: Race and Schools, July-August, 1969, pp. 31 ff.

30. See the Nader testimony and Penseno, op. cit. (reference 14).

31. It has been pointed out that "By and large, the /school/ system has expected the /inner-city/ student to be a failure, and unaware of its failure, has succeeded in creating the student in its own image." Urban Education Task Force, "Report on Urban Education," Congressional Record, January 20, 1970, E. 52.

32. Alice Miel, The Shortchanged Children of Suburbia. New York: Institute of Human Relations Press, 1967.

33. U. S. News and World Report, October 13, 1969, p. 42.

34. Address at The Lincoln Filene Center, June 4, 1969.

35. U. S. News, op. cit., p. 44.

36. Chester Davis, "Approaches to Black Education," Integrated Education: Race and Schools, November-December, 1970, p. 50.

37. For a review of the Windsor Hills' school achievement, see Olive Walker, "The Windsor Hills Story," Integrated Education: Race and Schools, May-June, 1970, pp. 4 ff. Miss Walker also makes the point that the Los Angeles Times, in reporting this matter, emphasized that the lowest rating schools in reading and IQ testing were "virtually all-black." The rating for Windsor Hills, however, was buried in an alphabetized listing of all schools. When black parents at Windsor Hills brought this to the attention of the Times, the paper's reporters said they did not feel that IQ testing was important! Consider, however, all the publicity given to Arthur Jensen's highly questionable findings about blacks and IQ's.

38. For a review of those school services and processes that appear to advance quality in education and those that impede student performance, see "On Quality

in Education" in John S. Gibson, The Massachusetts Department of Education: Proposals for Progress in Education. Medford, Massachusetts: The Lincoln Filene Center, Tufts University, 1970, pp. 155-195.

39. Mark A. Chesler, Teacher Training Designs for Improving Instruction in Interracial Classrooms, unpublished paper prepared for the U. S. Commission on Civil Rights, November 16-18, 1967.

40. See The Intergroup Relations Curriculum: A Program for Elementary School Education. Medford, Massachusetts: The Lincoln Filene Center, Tufts University, 1969, and the Center's materials in its Intergroup Relations Seminar.

41. Florence L. Denmark and Marcia Guttentag, "Effect of Integrated and Non-Integrated Programs on Cognitive Change in Pre-School Children," Perceptual Motor Skills, 29 (1969), 379.

42. Robert Rosenthal and Leonore Jackson, Pygmalion in the Classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1968.

43. Carithers, op. cit., p. 26.

44. Ibid, p. 35.

45. Paul N. Geisel, I.Q. Performance, Educational and Occupational Aspirations of Youth in a Southern City: A Racial Comparison. Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1962. p. 211.

46. Carithers, op. cit., pp. 38-41.

47. "Nathan Hare on Black Studies," Integrated Education: Race and Schools, November-December, 1970, p. 8. See also, Stephen S. Baratz and Joan C. Baratz, "Early Childhood Intervention: The Social Science Base of Institutional Racism," Harvard Educational Review, February, 1970, pp. 29, ff. The authors point out that "the failure to recognize and utilize existing cultural forms of the lower-class Negro community to teach new skills not only dooms intervention programs such as Head Start to failure, but also constitutes a form of institutional racism." (p. 29) A number of papers presented at the meetings of the American Educational Research Association also emphasized this important point. See in particular "An Evaluation of Some of Ashton-Warner's Assumptions About Beginning Reading," by

Stanley W. Bennett of the University of Maryland, who submitted findings to support Ashton-Warner's assertion that "own words are more meaningful, more emotional, and that they produce superior reading performance." (p. 57) F. Craig Johnson (ed.), Papers and Abstracts, 1971 Annual Meeting, American Educational Research Association. Washington, D. C.: AERA, 1971.

48. Franklin, op. cit. (Reference 25) See also the excellent monograph by Meyer Weinberg, Afro-American History: Separate or Interracial? Chicago: Integrated Education Associates, 1968, in which he declares that "an integrated treatment of American history leads to a truer appreciation of the black man's trials and triumphs." He warns, however, "against substituting new myths for older ones."

49. For a superb review of the "landmarks and milestones" of the black experience in America, see Lerone Bennett, Jr. Before the Mayflower: A History of the Negro in America. (revised edition) Chicago: Johnson Publishing Company, Inc., 1964, pp. 360-412.

50. See The Intergroup Relations Curriculum, op. cit., Vol. I, pp. 20-22, for research and findings on this point.

51. See Carithers, op. cit., for research findings on "the influence of parental and peer attitude upon the child's attitude" toward desegration, especially the point that "favorable parental attitudes /are/correlated with high socio-economic status, active church participation, non-Southern regional background, and low authoritarianism," p. 29.

52. Joe R. Feagin, "Black History and White Americans," Integrated Education: Race and Schools, November-December, 1970, pp. 26, 27.

53. See John I. Goodlad and M. Frances Klein, Behind the Classroom Door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1970.

54. We should find it necessary, in 1970, to revise our findings about elements of Negro self-concept that we set forth in the Lincoln Filene Center's publication of 1965, Negro Self-Concept, op. cit. See also, Weinberg, Desegregation Research: An Appraisal, op. cit. pp. 121 and 122.

55. For a critique of Coleman's findings, see Weinberg, ibid., p. 284 ff., and the observations of Samuel S. Bowles and Henry M. Levin in the Journal of Human Resources, Volume II, Winter, 1968, and Volume III, Summer, 1968.

56. For a strong critique of white investigators in the area of race relations, see Chester Davis, "Approaches to Black Education," op. cit. pp. 46-48.

57. Excerpts from a speech by Dr. Clark in New York on May 1, 1970, The New York Times, May 2, 1970.

58. For a brief review of the Ribicoff proposals, see The New York Times, November 29, 1970. For a solid rationale for the concept of a metropolitan school district, see Robert Bendinger, The Politics of Schools: A Crisis in Self-Government. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.

59. See Guthrie, op. cit. For a review of the role of a state in public education in the United States and the equal protection clause, see Gibson, The Massachusetts Department of Education, op. cit., p. xiv ff.

60. There is no question about the effectiveness of the busing program in Berkeley, California, and the busing programs in the Greater Hartford Area (Project Concern), in the Greater Boston area (Metco Program) White Plains, and others. With respect to some busing programs, however, two authorities find that:

> . . . Negro students are placed in a position of asking for something that is rightfully theirs; on the other, the departure of the most able and strongest personalities tends to isolate even further those who do not desegregate. /This often drains from the inner city many of the young black educational achievers who could be serving as peer models for those who are not achieving well in the schools. JSG/ The empirical evidence from our study impresses us with the folly of any kind of partial or quasi solution to the problem of school desegregation. Berj Hartootunian and Richard J. Morse, Characteristics of Negro and White High School Students Prior to Desegregation: A Study of Negro Students' Freedom of Choice. September, 1968, pp. 82 and 107. (ERIC #ED 02475)